

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain Special Order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of business.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 18, 2005, I was not in Washington due to weather delays that stranded my flight and therefore I was unable to vote. If I were here, I would like the RECORD to reflect I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 380, "yes" on rollcall vote 381, and "yes" on rollcall vote 382.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

BIDDING A FOND FAREWELL TO ANITA AND TOMMY MAGGIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize someone who is very dear to me, a member of my staff who has been with me since I was elected to Congress almost 16 years ago.

While Ms. Anita Maggio has been part of my office family since 1989, she has actually dutifully served Capitol Hill for 34 years. She has always been a dear friend to me and to the people of south Florida. Anita is a steadfast, loyal and dedicated member of my staff.

While other young staffers have come and gone, Anita has been the unwavering anchor in my office. Not only does Anita's mere presence boost morale in our office, but also she is a clearinghouse for information and contacts. Anita knows just about everybody on Capitol Hill, and everyone knows her. She has built a network of friends that is unequalled anywhere on the Hill. Everyone she meets is touched by her kindness and by her warmth.

Even though she does not have any children of her own, she has adopted all of us, including the staffers from other offices. She has the uncanny ability to make everyone feel loved and comfortable.

Anita Maggio is a very special soul. Her sensitivity and compassion touch all those who are blessed to know her.

Before joining my team, Anita was employed by my predecessor, the late Congressman Claude Pepper. Over the years, she has developed an intimate knowledge of the district and of the residents of south Florida.

When Anita retires, she will leave a void in my office that no other indi-

vidual will ever be able to fill. She will be retiring with her husband of 42 years, Tommy Maggio. Over the years, all of us have come to know Tommy Maggio. If you are lucky enough to know Tommy, you will know that he will be retiring from the Rayburn House garage after working there for an amazing 32 years.

It is with great sadness that I bid a fond farewell to one of the most special women I have ever met, a trusted friend and a member of the Ros-Lehtinen and Capitol Hill family, Anita Maggio. Anita will be forever remembered in our hearts.

We love you, Anita; and we love you, Tommy. Please do not make her cook for you every single night. Anita deserves a rest. Be good to her.

KEEPING JOBS IN AMERICA BY VOTING "NO" ON CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the prospect of a vote on yet another free trade agreement, putting a stamp of approval potentially on the failures of U.S. trade policy and the \$2 billion-a-day deficit that we are running, Members should approach this vote with caution.

First, they should be concerned about this bait-and-switch, the idea that we will before that vote have a vote to get tough with China, to begin to actually use our existing laws and authority to deal with the counterfeiting and the theft and the unfair trade practices of China.

We do not need to pass a bill to do that. The administration should just do it. Use the laws. Use the trade agreements. They told us that is why they wanted China in the WTO, that they were going to enforce sanctions against China. They are not filing complaints against China under the existing laws.

They do not need new authority; they just need to use their existing powers. So that is an attempt to give some cover to some of the weak-kneed around here who want to stick with the President who is saying it is his highest priority to extend the failed trade policies of the United States to another five nations in Latin America.

The President was, unfortunately, sadly in error last weekend when he went down to the south and said to the textile workers who have been devastated by these free trade policies that this would be good for them and the American economy.

All the President has to do, and he probably has not had a chance to read it yet, but the United States International Trade Commission issued a report a year ago, 11 months ago, on CAFTA; and they said that in fact it is likely to have minimal impact on production, employment or prices in the United States. They went on to say

that, yes, it would cause a tiny bump up in exports, but guess what? Like every other trade agreement the U.S. has ever entered into, it would be a much bigger bump up in imports.

More lost jobs here at home will result from CAFTA. Do not be fooled. Think back to the predictions about the wonderful results that we were going to see from NAFTA and the fact that it was going to create 400,000 jobs in the United States. It actually logs 800,000. They were off by 1.2 million jobs. CAFTA will have the same net result.

We need a new trade policy, a trade policy that brings and keeps jobs that pay decent wages and provides benefits home here to the United States of America. We do not need to accelerate the race to the bottom. We do not need to ask the few remaining textile workers we have in this country to compete with people down in Central America who earn 50 cents an hour. And then to say that those people who earn 50 cents an hour are going to provide a tremendous boon to the U.S. economy because they will be buying luxury SUVs made in America and all sorts of other products manufactured here on that 50 cent an hour salary is so absurd that it is hard to believe that any thinking Member will swallow that argument.

If you just want to rubber-stamp, if you just want to follow the President and support the continued bipartisan failures of trade, Bill Clinton was a disaster on these issues, too, if you want to march down that path, then you can vote for CAFTA. But if you want to benefit the American people, manufacturing in the United States of America, our standard of living, our national security, if you want to see a turnaround in the \$2 billion a day we are borrowing from the rest of the world to finance our overseas manufacturing, then you will vote "no" on CAFTA, and a new day will dawn where we bring and keep jobs home to America.

VOTE "NO" ON CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am back on the floor again tonight, just like the gentleman that just spoke. I am from North Carolina, a State I am greatly proud of; but I am so concerned about this CAFTA bill.

I want to just go back to 1992, to the Presidential debates of that year, 1992. I want to quote one of the candidates for the United States Presidency, Ross Perot: "You implement that NAFTA, the Mexican Trade Agreement, where they pay people a dollar an hour, have no health care, no retirement, no pollution controls, and you are going to hear a giant sucking sound of jobs being pulled out of this country, right at a time when we need the tax base to pay the debt of this Nation."

□ 1800

RENEGOTIATE CAFTA

Mr. Speaker, what is so ironic about that is that we are in the same situation today. Our Nation is in so much debt, the deficit is about \$417 billion, \$7 trillion in debt itself; the average citizen of America owes about \$26,000 if they were going to pay off the debt of this Nation. How can we continue to send jobs overseas? Already, China has 1.5 million jobs since 1989. NAFTA itself, since we joined in 1993, in North Carolina alone, we have lost 200,000 manufacturing jobs; the United States has lost over 2.5 million manufacturing jobs.

Let me tell my colleagues what is so ironic. So many times when we have these debates, they say, well, if you create a better opportunity down in Guatemala, or whatever country it might be, then they are going to stay home. Let me tell my colleagues how ironic and ridiculous that is. The number of aliens has grown from 1.3 million people in 1992; that was the one year before NAFTA. Since NAFTA, 5.9 million illegal aliens have come across the border, and that is just for the year 2004. That is a 350 percent increase. It does not work. It only works if you are going to increase the livelihood of those people in those countries. It did not happen in Mexico, and it is not going to happen in these five countries in Central America.

Let me talk a little bit about CAFTA. CAFTA is the cousin of NAFTA. Eighty-five percent of the language in CAFTA is identical to the language in NAFTA; and, therefore, it is not going to do what needs to be done to help the American people and the American workers.

Let me talk about TPA, Trade Promotion Authority, which became the law of the land in August of 2002. My State of North Carolina, since that happened, 52,000 manufacturing jobs lost, and over 600,000 manufacturing jobs in the United States of America. CAFTA will not do what is being proposed by those who say we should pass CAFTA.

CAFTA is also going to be a way to allow the Chinese to back-door their goods to these five Central American countries, have them manufacture the product or put the product together, and then sell these duty-free over into America.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to say that I hope that we as a Congress will not pass CAFTA as it is drawn. If they want to go back to the table and redraw this legislation so that it is good for America and then good for these other countries, then we will look at it again. But as it is now, it is not good for the American government, it is not good for the American people, and I stand with my Republican friends, I stand with my Democratic friends, and I hope and believe that we will defeat CAFTA. It needs to be defeated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last year, this Congress was promised a vote on the Central American Free Trade Agreement by the end of 2004. December 31 came and went. Then, at a White House news conference, the President called on Congress to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement by Memorial Day. May 31 came and went. In June, Congress was again promised a vote, which was supposed to have been before July 4. Independence Day came and went.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Because dozens of Republicans and Democrats, including my friends who are joining us tonight, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), earlier the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and others, because of the strong opposition by both parties, from small farmers and ranchers to organized labor, from small manufacturers to environmentalists, from religious leaders, from Catholic bishops in Central America and the Dominican Republic, to Lutheran and Presbyterian and Jewish and Episcopal leaders in our country, all of us speak with one strong, united voice: renegotiate the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

Those of us opposed to this CAFTA do want a trade agreement with Central America; but we want a trade agreement, as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) says, that benefits our whole Nation, not just a few; not one crafted, not a trade agreement crafted, negotiated by a select few for a select few.

As the President travels the Nation trying to sell this CAFTA to the American public, he is hearing firsthand from U.S. workers, from small business owners and family farmers and family ranchers and religious leaders that they do not want this CAFTA, either. Their message, as is the message coming from us in this body in both parties, is loud and clear: renegotiate this Central American Free Trade Agreement.

In response to the President's trip this past Friday to North Carolina, a newspaper headline read: "Bush Sells Trade Pact in Hostile Territory." A Huntsville Times Alabama editorial on Sunday reads: "Say No to the Central American Free Trade Agreement." A Wall Street Journal headline, a newspaper traditionally very supportive of trade agreements, a Wall Street Journal headline yesterday read: "Cafta is No Cure-All For Central America."

This CAFTA represents more than a decade of failed trade policies. Just look what has happened with our trade policies just since the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and I in 1992 came to this Congress. In 1992 we

had a trade deficit in this country of \$38 billion. That means we sold \$38 billion less, exported, than we imported. In 2004, last year, that trade deficit was \$618 billion. It went from \$38 billion to \$618 billion in just a dozen years. How do we argue that our trade policy is working when our trade deficit has gone from \$38 billion to \$618 billion, and all of the lost manufacturing jobs in North Carolina and Idaho and California and Illinois and all over this country, including my State of Ohio? How do you argue that our trade policy is working?

CAFTA, Mr. Speaker, has languished in Congress for more than a year. Normally, trade agreements are voted on within 60 days. It passed the Senate by the narrowest margin ever of any trade agreement in that body. That is because we know this agreement is a continuation of the North American Free Trade Agreement, a dysfunctional cousin of NAFTA, a trade agreement which failed to live up to its lofty promises.

It is the same old story. Every time there is a trade agreement, whether it is Bill Clinton or whether it is George Bush, they tell us three things: they say more jobs for Americans, they say more manufactured products exported from the U.S. overseas, and they say that it will mean better wages for workers and a higher standard of living for people in the developing world. With every trade agreement, these promises fall flat.

Benjamin Franklin said the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and over and expecting a different outcome. That is what has happened with our trade agreements. This CAFTA will not enable Central American workers to buy cars made in Toledo, Ohio or software developed in Seattle or textiles and apparel from North Carolina or prime beef from Nebraska. This CAFTA is about U.S. companies moving plants to Honduras, outsourcing jobs to Guatemala, exploiting cheap labor in El Salvador.

I will make one prediction, Mr. Speaker. If CAFTA comes up next week, they will call it up in the middle of the night, they will hold the rollcall open for several hours, they will twist arms to try to get this agreement passed. Instead, we should throw out this failed agreement, go back to the drawing board, renegotiate a CAFTA that lifts workers up, that makes sense for workers in all seven CAFTA countries, including our own.

When the world's poorest people, Mr. Speaker, can buy American products and not just make them, then we will know that our trade policies are finally working.

CAFTA PUTS U.S. SOVEREIGNTY AND CONSTITUTION UNDER ATTACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.